1	
2	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
3	x
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Petitioner, New York, N.Y.
6	v. 10-2095-cr
7	
8	JOHN DOE.
9	Respondent.
10	x
11	February 14, 2011
12	1:30 p.m.
13	Before:
14	HON. JOSE A. CABRANES, Presiding HON. ROSEMARY S. POOLER
15	HON. ROSEMARY S. POOLER HON. DENNY CHIN
16	Circuit Judges
17	APPEARANCES
18	TODD KAMINSKY
19	PETER A. NORLING MARSHALL MILLER
20	ELIZABETH KRAMER Attorneys for Petitioner
21	RICHARD E. LERNER
22	Attorney for Respondent
23	KELLY ANN MOORE
24	Attorney for John Doe
25	
i	

1	INTEREST CHARGE COLUMN OF A DEFENT C
2	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
3	x
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Petitioner, New York, N.Y.
6	v. 10-2095-cr
7	
8	JOHN DOE.
9	Respondent.
10	x
11	February 14, 2011
12	1:30 p.m. Before:
13	Berore:
14	HON. JOSE A. CABRANES, Presiding HON. ROSEMARY S. POOLER
15	HON. ROSEMARY S. POOLER HON. DENNY CHIN
16	Cincuit Tuis
17	Circuit Judges  APPEARANCES
18	AF P BARANCES
19	TODD KAMINSKY PETER A. NORLING
20	MARSHALL MILLER ELIZABETH KRAMER
21	Attorneys for Petitioner
22	RICHARD E. LERNER Attorney for Respondent
23	KELLY ANN MOORE
24	Attorney for John Doe
	1
25	

1	JUDGE CABRANES: Good afternoon. This is <u>United</u>
2	States of America v. John Doe. It has many captions. I will
3	call the role of roll of counsel and the parties in two appeals
4.	that have been consolidated for purposes of argument and that
5	at least for now bear the following captions: Richard Roe v.
6	USA and John Doe, Docket No. 10-2905, and Richard Roe,
7	Petitioner v. USA, Respondent and John Doe 1, John Doe 2,
8	Defendants, Docket No. 11-479. I ask each of the persons whose
9	names I call out to simply answer my confirming his or her
10	presence.
11	This is not the time for anything more than the word
12	"present" and an indication of whether you are admitted to the
13	bar of this court. You will each have time to express your
14	views after this roll call and after I make a brief
15	introductory statement.
16	Richard Roe, also known as Frederick Oberlander.
17	MR. ROE: Present, and I am not admitted in this
18	court.
19	JUDGE CABRANES: We usually stand.
20	MR. ROE: I'm sorry.
21	JUDGE CABRANES: Are you admitted to any federal
22	court?
23	MR. ROE: Southern District.
24	JUDGE CABRANES: Counsel for Richard Roe is Richard
25	Lerner.

1	MR. LERNER: Yes. I am present and admitted to
2	practice before this court.
3	JUDGE CABRANES: Thomas W. Hyland.
4	MR. LERNER: He was unable to make it here today.
5	JUDGE CABRANES: Unable to make it today. Judy
6	Selmeci.
7	MS. SELMECI: I am admitted to practice in this Court.
8	JUDGE CABRANES: You are admitted to the bar of this
9	court. Thank you.
10	Counsel for the United States, Todd Kaminsky.
11	MR. KAMINSKY: Present, your Honor, and admitted.
12	JUDGE CABRANES: Elizabeth Kramer.
13	MS. KRAMER: Present, your Honor, and admitted.
14	JUDGE CABRANES: Marshall Miller.
15	MR. MILLER: Present your Honor add admitted.
16	JUDGE CABRANES: Peter Norling.
17	MR. NORLING: Present and admitted.
18	JUDGE CABRANES: Counsel for John Doe, Kelly Anne
19	Moore of Morgan Lewis & Bockius.
20	MS. MOORE: Present and admitted your Honor.
21	THE COURT: David Snyder of Morgan Lewis & Bockius?
22	MR. SNYDER: Present, your Honor, and not admitted.
23	JUDGE CABRANES: Are you admitted to any federal bar?
24	MR. SNYDER: No, your Honor.
25	JUDGE CABRANES: You are admitted to what bar?

1 MR. SNYDER: State of New York. 2 JUDGE CABRANES: Nader Mobargha of Beys Stein & Mobargha. 3 MR. MOBARGHA: Present and not admitted to this Court. 4 5 JUDGE CABRANES: To what court are you admitted? MR. MOBARGHA: The Southern and Eastern Districts of 6 New York. 7 JUDGE CABRANES: And the State of New York? 8 9 MR. MOBARGHA: Yes. JUDGE CABRANES: Is there anyone else whose name I 10 have not called? 11 12 MR. BEYS: Yes, your Honor. Michael Beys of Beys, 13 Stein & Mobargha for defendant-appellee Doe, present and 14 admitted. 15 JUDGE CABRANES: Thank you. 16 We are here for oral argument in two related matters. 17 As I indicated, they bear captions that at least temporarily 18 employ the coined names of "John Doe" and "Richard Roe" -- the 19 cases that, as I noted, are docketed in the Court of Appeals as No. 10-2905-cr. and No. 11-479-cr. Both arrived from 20 21 long-lived proceedings in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York before Judge I. Leo Glasser. 22 The record will reflect that, pursuant to an order of the 23 24 Court, we are here in a closed courtroom. The proceedings here are being recorded by an official court reporter as well as by 25

electronic means. The record in these cases shall remain under seal until further order of the Court.

These matters came before this Court on an expedited and emergency basis. In documents placed before us, the government and the district court asserted serious concerns about the public dissemination of certain documents, in and out of state and federal court proceedings. These disclosures allegedly are in violation of court orders and allegedly could risk life-threatening injury to identifiable persons, including the person identified in our cases as John Doe.

As a result of the way in which these emergency matters were presented to the Court, and in order to try to maintain the status quo in volatile and confused circumstances until this expedited hearing could be held, this Court has entered a series of temporary sealing orders and/or injunctive orders.

Because these orders were entered in response to fast-breaking developments, the captions and references to petitioner and respondent are sometimes the victim of typographical errors. The captions will be adjusted in the course of this hearing or immediately thereafter. Suffice it to say for now that, regardless of any obvious typographical errors in the orders, we are all well aware that the sealing orders and temporary injunctions of the Court of Appeals have all been aimed at Richard Roe, an attorney at law, and at his

The

X12endoen SEALED It is not John Doe or the government who have 1 attorneys. sought to disseminate any of the material at issue here. 2 3 only parties who have indicated on the record an intention to disseminate the documents at issue here are Richard Roe and his 4 That much the court knows and that much all of you 5 attorneys. here know. 6 7 Accordingly, to avoid caption issues that may cause confusion on the record, let us speak today of Richard Roe and 8 9 John Doe, not of petitioner or respondent, nor of appellant and It is clear from the record, of course, that it is 10 appellees. Richard Roe and his lawyers who vigorously and openly wish to 11 disseminate these materials, and thus it is the government and 12 13 John Doe who wish to prevent Roe and his lawyers from doing so. 14 15 16

The first Court of Appeals order of consequence was an order of Judge Livingston sealing the record of this case and referring the emergency motions of the government to a regularly-convened motions panel.

We are that panel.

After this matter was referred to this motions panel, the Court entered a number of orders that re-affirmed the sealing order of Judge Livingston and otherwise sought to maintain the status quo until this hearing could be held.

We have taken precautions to assure that all counsel of record and the party known as Richard Roe receive timely notice of these orders promptly upon entry of the order by

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

X12endoen SEALED e-mail and/or fax and/or phone calls from the clerk's office. 1 Unless informed otherwise, we will assume that notice of these 2 several orders was effected. 3 You may wish to take notes of the Court orders to 4 which I refer. In order to assist you in this regard, the 5 Court asked the Deputy Clerk of Court to provide each of you 6 7 with copies of these orders before we convened here. informed that sets of these copies were provided to all counsel 8 of record and that each of you has copies of these orders 9 10 before you at this time. They include: 11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- (1) An order of February 8, 2011 granting the government's motion to temporarily seal the docket here and seeking to prevent any public dissemination of matters subject to existing sealing orders;
- (2) An order of February 9, 2011 denying a motion to, among other things, vacate the court's earlier so-called gua sponte order closing the courtroom for today's hearing;
- (3) An order of February 10, 2011 that, among other things, consolidated these two docketed appeals until further order of the Court. It also responded to reports or apparent threats by Richard Roe and/or his counsel to disseminate sealed materials at issue here in other court proceedings or public The Court responded to these reports or apparent threats in the order of February 10 by, among other things,

temporarily enjoining "all parties . . . from disseminating or distributing in any manner and in any court, proceeding, or forum any documents filed in th[ese appeals] or in related proceedings in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York or the contents thereof, to any member of the public or media except to those persons directly involved in the parties' legal representation, who shall be bound by this order of confidentiality and sealing."

The February 10, 2011 order also affirmatively enjoined Richard Roe, who is a member of the bar, to submit in writing by 5 p.m. on Friday, February 11, "a list of any public or media persons . . . to whom he or his counsel have revealed or distributed in any manner the filings in these proceedings or the contents thereof."

This February 10 order also affirmatively enjoined Richard Roe to identify with specificity the documents or contents that were revealed or distributed to each such person. This, too, was to have been done by Friday, February 11 at 5:00 p.m.

I understand that we have a letter that was indeed filed on Friday but that has come to our attention only this morning and which apparently was not conveyed to opposing counsel. We will deal with that matter in a moment.

I think we all know what "under seal" means -- but perhaps not, so I wish to make it clear that for the time being

and until this Court is able to sort out the claims of a breach of court sealing orders, these proceedings are confidential and the record is subject to a sealing order of this Court, the violation of which will subject any violator of our sealing orders to punishment for civil and/or criminal contempt of court.

It should likewise be clear that the parties hereto are always free to seek review of our orders from the Supreme Court of the United States. That said, while our sealing orders remain in effect, as they may be supplemented by additional orders today or in the near future, any and all papers filed in the Supreme Court referring to matters or documents subject to extant sealing orders shall be filed in the Supreme Court under seal.

I have also been informed today that there is a copy of a purported petition for certiorari that was filed or was to be filed in the Supreme Court. Apparently, it was not filed under seal. We will expect that counsel of record will take all the necessary precautions to seek to place that material under seal until further order of this Court or of the Supreme Court.

These preliminary matters having been completed, I will ask the representative of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York to come forward and provide a general status report on the proceedings to date and to provide

X12endoen SEALED a brief statement of what relief, if any, the government seeks 1 2 today. We will then hear from counsel for Richard Roe, from 3 4 whom we likewise will seek a statement of the relief he seeks from this Court. 5 MR. KAMINSKY: Good afternoon. May it please the 6 Court, I'm Todd Kaminsky. And I represent the appellee, the 7 United States. And the government is here today to argue for a 8 9 continued sealing of the appellate docket and now what is the consolidated dockets before this court. 10 The government, as laid out in its brief, believes 11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that an unsealing of the docket at this time and a public filing and release of the documents that opposing counsel would like to, and Roe and his attorney would like to release at this time pose a substantial probability of prejudice to Doe's safety in this case.

JUDGE CABRANES: Could you tell us whether at the moment all the documents in Doe's criminal proceeding and in the Southern District of New York civil matter, are they all now under seal as far as you know?

MR. KAMINSKY: The Southern District, your Honor, they are not all under seal. Although I am not a party to that civil proceeding, I've gone on to the electronic PACER system and several documents can be accessed. The main document at issue in that case, the complaint filed by Mr. Roe that

contains all of the damaging information about Mr. Doe, that cannot be accessed publicly at this time.

The Eastern District docket, currently being presided over by the Honorable Judge Glasser, is completely under seal. There are no accessible documents at this time.

JUDGE CABRANES: Can you describe in general terms why these documents are so sensitive, particularly since some of them seem to be somewhat antique, and there have been in the past some news accounts of the activities or purported activities of John Doe?

MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, your Honor.

Mr. Doe's cooperation was of an extraordinary depth and breadth, almost unseen, at least in this United States Attorney's Office.

He cooperated, unlike some cooperators who cooperate within one type of organized crime family or over one type of crime, Mr. Doe's cooperation runs a gamut that is seldom seen. It involves violent organizations such as Al Qaeda, it involves foreign governments, it involves Russian organized crime. And, most particularly, it involves various families of La Cosa Nostra. By that specifically I mean an individual on the ruling board of the Genovese crime family, a captain in the Bonanno crime family, a soldier in the Gambino crime family, the list goes on and on.

The reason why I bring that up, your Honor, is that

all of the documents that are currently within the 1998 docket in front of Judge Glasser mention Mr. Doe's name or refer to his cooperation.

Now, at the time of the sealing in 1998 and through the beginning of 2008, Mr. Doe worked in a proactive capacity actively aiding grand jury investigations that involved surreptitious recordings of individuals as well as other undercover actions.

JUDGE POOLER: Counsel, are you satisfied that he's told the truth in all cases?

MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, from the record that I have seen, and it was my job for his sentencing to review all of his statements to the FBI, I was not the individual that worked with him, but I have no information that he has been untruthful for any purpose or to any extent.

JUDGE POOLER: You are relying on his information in other cases?

MR. KAMINSKY: Yes.

There are no current prosecutions that involve the necessary testimony or information from Doe at this time. But there got to be a situation where ten years of constant undercover work and arrests and indictments as well as convictions, some very extensive, made as a result of his actions got to a point where it became too dangerous to allow a confirmation of his cooperation to be known.

1	There have been public accounts. They have been
2	extensive in terms of their allegations, but they have been
3	lacking in terms of their corroboration and the government seal
4	of approval, if you will. The government feels that is an
5	important difference.
6	JUDGE CABRANES: At this particular proceeding I take
7	it that the government is seeking a temporary injunction, that
8	is, for the time being, during the pendency of the appeal,
9	which presumably would sort out all of these issues.
10	MR. KAMINSKY: That's correct. The government
11	certainly envisions a time when part of this docket will be
12	unsealed, and I note to the Court that the actual filing
13	occurred in May, meaning the Southern District complaint that
14	started this whole incident. But only on February 3 and 4 did
15	Mr. Roe or counsel for Mr. Roe finally make a motion, it was
16	actually a demand below to unseal the docket. And I do not
17	know what procedures the district court intends to employ. As
18	<u>U.S. v. Doe</u> from 1995 states, there are numerous ways for a
19	district court to go about determining
20	JUDGE CABRANES: How many cases are there, as far as
21	you know, in the Southern District of New York that are
22	arguably related to these matters?
23	MR. KAMINSKY: Only one, your Honor.
24	JUDGE CABRANES: Only one?
25	MR. KAMINSKY: Yes.

1	JUDGE CABRANES: This is the one before Judge
2	Buchwald?
3	MR. KAMINSKY: Correct.
4	JUDGE CHIN: Judge Buchwald never sealed that case,
5	right? She just sealed the complaint as opposed to the entire
6	case?
7	MR. KAMINSKY: That's correct. Your Honor, I stand
8	corrected. I have not been involved in the civil matters. I
9	turned to Mr. Doe's counsel. I have been informed the answer
LO	is three, three related matters.
L1	JUDGE POOLER: Counsel, I read an article in the New
L2	York Times that seems to have vital information about John Doe
L3	How can you keep it secret when it's been in the New York
14	Times?
15	MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, there are a number of
L6	things, a number of responses to that.
17	JUDGE POOLER: That was submitted to me I didn't go
18	searching for it. It was submitted with one filing. I guess
19	must be from Richard Roe.
20	MR. KAMINSKY: The government alerted the Court to
21	that.
22	JUDGE POOLER: OK.
23	MR. KAMINSKY: In that filing, your Honor, there were
24	three individuals who pleaded guilty together as part of the
25	underlying crime who became cooperators together and then who

worked for the government. One of those cooperators became disgruntled, spoke to the New York Times and said, I was there I saw it happen. But the Times itself couldn't find any confirmation of that.

It may be that during a future determination of how much could be unsealed that article will play a role. But the government feels that opposing counsel's actions in this case of unilaterally deciding to out the cooperator within the context of a current litigation is just not an acceptable way of doing that.

However, your Honor, the government also feels that it is a world of difference between the Times speculating about something and it being enough of a government stamp of approval to warrant retaliatory action against somebody. The government feels at this time that the threats are still extensive enough that even with that article it would be extremely dangerous to have Mr. Doe's cooperation revealed.

JUDGE CABRANES: To the extent that we may be restraining dissemination of these materials to the press or to other media, I have a number of questions for you. These questions will be a little specific. They might seem a bit redundant, but I want to make sure that we have everything set forth very clearly on this record.

And now I'm turning to the famous question of prior restraint. One way of evaluating a prior restraint is to

examine the gravity of the evil discounted by the impossibility 1 that it will occur. 2 What exactly is the danger you fear here if the 3 information in these documents becomes public? 4 MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, it's twofold: I'll start 5 with the, if you will, less grave one first. 6 As this Court stated in Amedeo II, the knowledge that 7 someone who is a cooperator and has gone to the extent that 8 Mr. Doe has will be an outed individual who will have to live 9 10 his or her life in fear I think is something that will dissuade such cooperation in the future. As that Court said, if such 11 informants in the present or future cases anticipate that their 12 cooperation will likely become a matter of public knowledge, 13 valuable cooperation might cease. 14 Second of all, I think it's a very real harm that 15 could come to Mr. Doe himself. The very families that Mr. Doe 16 cooperated against have killed witnesses in the past. 17 That's been recorded. And his cooperation --18 JUDGE CABRANES: You are speaking of organized crime 19 families? 20 MR. KAMINSKY: That's correct. And his cooperation 21 was not just the type of cooperation not to be noticed. 22 shut down an enterprise that shut off the valve to tens of 23 millions of dollars. 24 JUDGE POOLER: Do they know who the cooperator is? 25

1	MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, there are a number of
2	different individuals whom they may suspect. But Mr. Doe was,
3	depending how one looks at it, fortunate to not have to testify
4	over his 11-year career as a cooperator and none of the
5	individuals in organized crime had ever received any, as far as
6	the government knows, any official acknowledgement of that
7	cooperation.
8	JUDGE POOLER: Has he been sentenced for his
9	conviction?
10	MR. KAMINSKY: Yes.
11	JUDGE CABRANES: So I take it that in your experience
12	you are telling us that the danger here can be characterized as
13	great and certain?
14	MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, the government certainly
15	affirms the word "great." "Certain" is something the
16	government is a little bit less comfortable with. I'm
17	comfortable with the words in Doe of a substantial probability.
18	I believe that probability is substantial.
19	JUDGE CABRANES: So, if I understand you correctly,
20	you're saying that the critical government interest here is
21	protecting the life of the cooperating witness, among other
22	things?
23	MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, your Honor.
24	JUDGE CABRANES: Are there any less intrusive measures
25	other than sealing that would be adequate to prevent the danger

we are talking about?

MR. KAMINSKY: The government thinks not, your Honor.

The extent of what sealing would be left on this record is still something that is to be worked out. But the government advocates for a sealing that does not release the real name of Mr. Doe and does not reveal facts that would alert other individuals to his cooperation or conviction.

JUDGE CABRANES: Is it the case that various orders entered by the district court and the Court of Appeals involve no prior restraints on the press or media?

MR. KAMINSKY: That's correct.

JUDGE CABRANES: That is, we are not talking about preventing a news organization from publishing a matter of public concern or impinging on editorial discretion.

MR. KAMINSKY: No, your Honor, and the government feels that's particularly salient in this case. The Supreme Court in Gentile v. State of Nevada has laid out a clear distinction between attorney speech, especially that in the context of ongoing litigation, meaning not an attorney as a private citizen but as an attorney acting as a hired legal representative and that of the press. It is regulated by an entirely different standard, and the Supreme Court has said that an attorney's First Amendment rights do not give him a blanket opportunity to commit what are clearly unethical acts.

JUDGE POOLER: Indeed, as we discussed a moment ago,

1	this has been published information about this case has been
2	published.
3	MR. KAMINSKY: That's correct, your Honor.
4	JUDGE CABRANES: Let me understand something about the
5	proceedings before Judge Glasser.
6	Do I understand correctly that Judge Glasser only
7	issued a permanent injunction with respect to the presentence
8	report?
9	MR. KAMINSKY: Correct.
10	JUDGE CABRANES: And the cooperation agreement, the
11	proffer agreement, and the sealed indictment, what's their
12	status, and do they remain in the possession of Richard Roe?
13	MR. KAMINSKY: They remain in the possession of
14	Richard Roe. I believe the copies of these documents remain in
15	the possession of Mr. Roe and other individuals to whom he
16	originally sent them when he filed the complaint.
17	But Judge Glasser has currently not reviewed them, has
18	not resolved that issue. It was clear to Judge Glasser that
19	the PSR, according to <u>Charmer</u> was a clear issue of law where
20	the document had to be returned by Mr. Roe, but he asked for
21	briefing on what powers he had to ask for documents to be
22	returned that were taken.
23	The issue there was, your Honor, who did the original
24	sealing order apply to, and if Mr. Roe was not a party to that
25	original proceeding did Judge Glasser have the authority to

The government has written on that matter and has 1 enjoin him. 2 briefed the issue that, according to the all writs act, Judge 3 Glasser does have such power. JUDGE CABRANES: And that matter is still before Judge 4 Glasser? 5 MR. KAMINSKY: That's correct. 6 I would just like to remind the Court that there was I 7 standstill agreement between Roe and Doe for about four months 8 where nothing happened at all, and then in the fall the 9 litigation resumed again. And that's when the government filed 10 a letter in furtherance of another injunction. 11 JUDGE POOLER: Does the government have a theory as to 1.2 how Roe got ahold of these documents? 13 MR. KAMINSKY: We do, your Honor. Judge Glasser held 14 a day of hearings where he called Roe to testify, and Mr. Roe 15 stated that it was a client of his --16 17 JUDGE POOLER: Not John Doe? MR. KAMINSKY: No. A client of his had given them to 18 Mr. Doe testified that he kept them in his office, and 19 Judge Glasser came to the conclusion at the end of the hearings 20 that a client of Mr. Roe had stolen them from Mr. Doe, from his 21 office, and had provided them to Mr. Roe. Judge Glasser said 22 on the record that it was clear that they were taken under 23 less-than-legal circumstances. 24 JUDGE POOLER: And Mr. Roe still has them? Attorney 25

1	Roe still has them.
2	MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, and copies.
3	JUDGE POOLER: And copies of them?
4	MR. KAMINSKY: Yes.
5	JUDGE POOLER: Have you asked for them back?
6	MR. KAMINSKY: I don't know if we specifically have
7	spoken on a one-to-one basis with them, but we have certainly
8	made clear our position that they are not entitled to them.
9	JUDGE POOLER: You have never requested them to be
10	turned in to the U.S. Attorney's Office.
11	MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, Judge Glasser directed
12	Mr. Roe to return the PSR to the U.S. Attorney's Office, and
13	we've never received his copy, so we did not.
14	JUDGE CABRANES: Did that happen as far as you know?
15	MR. KAMINSKY: No, we haven't been given anything.
16	JUDGE CABRANES: You don't know of any reason to
17	believe that the presentence report was returned.
18	MR. KAMINSKY: At this time the government is positive
19	that Mr. Roe has copies of the PSR that he says that he is
20	under no obligation to return to anyone.
21	JUDGE CABRANES: But there is an order directing him
22	to return his copies of the PSR?
23	MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, and he appealed that.
24	JUDGE CABRANES: But we don't know whether he has
25	obeyed that order.

1	MR. KAMINSKY: He has clearly not obeyed that order,
2	your Honor.
3	JUDGE CABRANES: I see. Are you aware whether any
4	authorities in the federal or state governments are
5	investigating or considering criminal prosecution of the people
6	who apparently stole these documents in the first place?
7	MR. KAMINSKY: I have. I recently been in contact or
8	received a call from assistant district attorneys in Manhattan
9	where Mr. Doe's office was. I guess that would be the
10	jurisdiction for the theft. But I am not involved in that and
11	don't know how far it's gone.
12	JUDGE CABRANES: Thank you.
13	Let's hear from unless my colleagues have any other
14	questions?
15	JUDGE POOLER: No.
16	JUDGE CABRANES: We'll turn to counsel for Roe.
17	MR. KAMINSKY: Thank you, your Honor.
18	MR. LERNER: Good afternoon, your Honors. I would
19	first like to correct the record. The PSR which Mr. Roe
20	received directly from the former client at the company, who I
21	shall not name, that was handed up to the Court as an exhibit
22	during the proceedings. That original is in the Court's
23	possession.
24	There was further briefing
25	JUDGE CABRANES: In possession of Judge Glasser?

MR. LERNER: Yes. 1 JUDGE CABRANES: Do you or your client continue to 2 have copies of the presentence report? 3 MR. LERNER: Yes, electronic copies. 4 Now, there's affidavits -- I don't know whether your 5 Honors have seen the affidavit from the company's general 6 7 counsel. He states that when he received the complaint in the Southern District action from Mr. Roe, and this was before 8 there was any injunctive relief or a sealing order issued, that 9 attorney, Mr. Schwartz, disseminated it to many people. 10 JUDGE CABRANES: Who is Mr. Schwartz? 11 MR. LERNER: He was the general counsel of the company 12 who I think I am -- shall I name the company here? 13 JUDGE CABRANES: Yes, I think so. 14 MR. LERNER: Bay Rock. He was the general counsel of 15 Bay Rock. He disseminated when it was received, when that 16 complaint was received from the attorney for Bay Rock. 17 firm was Akerman Senterfitt. Akerman Senterfitt, a Miami firm, 18 represented Bay Rock. That complaint was provided as a 19 courtesy to the Akerman Senterfitt firm with all of the 20 exhibits. 21 That e-mail was then forwarded to Bay Rock's general 22 counsel who disseminated it. 23 JUDGE CABRANES: Those exhibits of court documents 24 included the presentence report?

1	MR. LERNER: Included the presentence report.
2	JUDGE CABRANES: Anything else? Any of these other
3	documents? Cooperation agreement?
4	MR. LERNER: The complaint, the cooperation agreement,
5	and the criminal information.
6	So what's before the Court below
7	JUDGE CABRANES: Well, you've submitted today a letter
8	dated February 11 which I have not been able to fully digest
9	shall we say. You know the letter I'm referring to.
10	MR. LERNER: Yes, if I may summarize it, simply
11	indicating the attorneys with whom Mr. Roe has consulted with
12	regard to various issues that are connected with this.
13	JUDGE CABRANES: Does the list of persons or the
14	number of persons to whom you just referred as having received,
15	electronically or otherwise, these documents, are they listed
16	in your filing?
17	MR. LERNER: I don't think we mentioned Mr. Schwartz.
18	JUDGE CABRANES: Are you going to be able to give us
19	that information in another letter?
20	MR. LERNER: I think we can supplement that. I
21	indicated that it was to the best of our abilities at the time.
22	JUDGE CABRANES: But you think you will be able to do
23	that, to supplement it as best you can?
24	MR. LERNER: I know that I provided full information
25	as to who I personally disclosed it to

X12endoen

25

SEALED

And that included --1 2 JUDGE CABRANES: What about your client Richard Roe? MR. LERNER: Mr. Roe, as he indicated in his 3 declaration, to the best of his knowledge he has disclosed 4 5 that. JUDGE CABRANES: This letter to which I have just 6 referred was submitted to the Court. Was it submitted under 7 seal? 8 MR. LERNER: It was not. 9 JUDGE CABRANES: It was not. Was a copy conveyed to 10 11 counsel for the government? I indicated in the letter that I am MR. LERNER: No. 12 providing privileged information, however, if the Court wishes 13 14 to disclose it --JUDGE CABRANES: I am a little confused. You didn't 15 file it under seal. You didn't feel it was necessary to keep 16 it from the world. You felt it was only necessary to keep it 17 from the government. But, of course, they can go on the 18 19 electronic site and print it out. So you don't mind if this is 20 copied and given to the government? MR. LERNER: I would not strongly object. 21 JUDGE CHIN: Was it filed electronically? 22 MR. LERNER: Actually, I did not know that it would be 23 filed in the docket. I was asked by the calendar clerk to 24

provide the letter by 5:00 p.m., and I faxed it directly to the

1 | calendar clerk.

JUDGE POOLER: Attached to your letter is the declaration of Richard Roe using his real name?

MR. LERNER: Yes.

JUDGE POOLER: Wasn't that a violation of previous orders?

MR. LERNER: I don't know that Roe could sign a declaration in the name of Roe. I don't know. As I indicated in my letter, I didn't know how to deal with that from a technical perspective.

JUDGE CABRANES: Inasmuch as you have no objection to sharing this letter of February 11 with the government, for the sake of expedition, I am going to give my copy to the clerk to pass it to the government, since we can get our own copy off the computer.

MR. LERNER: I would like to correct another statement that was made earlier, and then I would like to proceed with the argument.

The Court directly asked the government whether any of these documents are out in the public domain. The answer, and now that I can, I think I can fairly -- well, may I state a publication on the record as to where -- OK. Business Week published an article in 1998. That article is called, The Case of the Gym Bag that Squealed. That article indicates that Business Week has a copy of the complaint. That article is

still up on the website. 1 I submit that if Business Week has the right, as they 2 obviously do, to disseminate that complaint and to discuss that 3 complaint, so too --4 5 JUDGE CHIN: Did you say 1998? MR. LERNER: Yes. And that article is still up. 6 7 JUDGE CHIN: And the complaint, which complaint are you talking about? 8 9 MR. LERNER: The complaint in the Eastern District 10 action. 11 JUDGE CHIN: In the criminal case, OK. 12 MR. LERNER: The Eastern District action, the criminal case, yes. That article, which remains on the website, 13 14 indicates that Business Week has a copy of the criminal 15 complaint, which means that they got it from the government or 16 they got it from the FBI. OK. So it is not --17 JUDGE POOLER: Why does it naturally follow that they 18 got it from the government or the FBI? 19 MR. LERNER: Well, one would presume that Mr. Doe did 20 not give it to Business Week. 21 JUDGE POOLER: And Mr. Roe was not involved at that point? 22 23 MR. LERNER: No. Mr. Roe wasn't involved in anything 24 related to Bay Rock until I believe he was retained to

represent the aforementioned person or assist in prepping an

X12endoen

25

SEALED

1	individual for a deposition.
2	JUDGE POOLER: When was that? When did he come in
3	contact with the facts of this case?
4	MR. LERNER: Well, he's been involved with the facts
5	of the Bay Rock matter for about two years. He's been
6	preparing a RICO complaint. It was only in March of 2010 that
7	the employee at Bay Rock who Mr. Roe was assisting to prepare
8	for a deposition said, I know you are working on this case,
9	these documents might be of use to you.
10	JUDGE CABRANES: Can you set forth precisely how your
11	client obtained the sealed presentence report, the cooperation
12	agreement, and the other documents from those criminal cases?
13	MR. LERNER: Yes. There was testimony on the record
14	that Mr. Row obtained them from that individual who he was
15	assisting to prep for a deposition.
16	We supplemented that with e-mails that we submitted to
17	the judge below. That indicated that these documents were
18	maintained on the Bay Rock company's website I'm sorry,
19	internal computer system.
20	Mr. Doe had directed that witness who I'm referring
21	to, the deponent, as part of his job
22	JUDGE CABRANES: Who was that witness?
23	MR. LERNER: May I state his name?
24	JUDGE CABRANES: Yes.

MR. LERNER: Bernstein, Joshua Bernstein.

1	had instructed Joshua Bernstein to keep backup
2	copies of all documents, all important documents.
3	So, these documents were on the Bay Rock server. Now,
4	Mr. Doe testified below that he wasn't a partner in the
5	company. He was a mere employee. There's nothing in the
6	record to indicate that he had an expectation of privacy as to
7	e-mails, e-mail documents maintained on the company server.
8	But these documents were downloading these documents and
9	archiving them and reviewing them was part of Mr. Bernstein's
10	job.
11	JUDGE POOLER: Is that a public website or
12	MR. LERNER: No, it is a private internal company
13	website.
14	JUDGE POOLER: Right.
15	MR. LERNER: So it was obtained lawfully. And I will
16	not point out that under the Pentagon papers case it is
17	· ·
1'	irrelevant whether the documents were obtained lawfully or
18	irrelevant whether the documents were obtained lawfully or unlawfully. They may be used and published as
18	unlawfully. They may be used and published as
18 19	unlawfully. They may be used and published as  JUDGE POOLER: The PSR's have their own sealing
18 19 20	unlawfully. They may be used and published as  JUDGE POOLER: The PSR's have their own sealing regimen that does not relate to any order of the court.
18 19 20 21	unlawfully. They may be used and published as  JUDGE POOLER: The PSR's have their own sealing  regimen that does not relate to any order of the court.  JUDGE CABRANES: We are not dealing here with prior
18 19 20 21 22	unlawfully. They may be used and published as  JUDGE POOLER: The PSR's have their own sealing regimen that does not relate to any order of the court.  JUDGE CABRANES: We are not dealing here with prior restraint of the press or the media. That's what the Pentagon
18 19 20 21 22 23	unlawfully. They may be used and published as  JUDGE POOLER: The PSR's have their own sealing regimen that does not relate to any order of the court.  JUDGE CABRANES: We are not dealing here with prior restraint of the press or the media. That's what the Pentagon papers case was about.

X12endoen

## SEALED

1	grievances by filing a complaint in an action
2	JUDGE CHIN: Do you acknowledge, right or wrong,
3	whether the sealing order was correctly issued or not correctly
4	issued, do you acknowledge that your client has to comply,
5	subject to his right to appeal?
6	MR. LERNER: Your Honor, I am not certain which
.7	sealing order you're referring to.
8	JUDGE CHIN: Any order. If there is an order in place
9	prohibiting him from disclosing certain things, do you
10	acknowledge that he must comply with that order subject to his
11	ability to appeal and get relief from a higher court?
12	MR. LERNER: May I read directly from the transcript
13	below with respect to that issue?
14	JUDGE CHIN: I would like it if you would answer my
15	question.
16	MR. LERNER: The answer to the question was answered
17	on the record by Mr. Roe. He said, My understanding is that a
18	sealing order is directed to court personnel and it is not an
19	in personam it is not an order against other individuals.
20	JUDGE CABRANES: Judge Chin directed his question to
21	you.
22	MR. LERNER: My answer is no, a sealing order is
23	directed to court personnel. It is not directed to
24	individuals. A sealing order may be accompanied by an
25	injunctive order prohibiting speech.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

JUDGE CHIN: What is the point of a sealing order if a party could freely disseminate the document? It would completely undermine the point of the sealing order.

MR. LERNER: Judge Glasser stated on the record that there is no sealing order in the case, so he could not have violated a sealing order. Moreover, in the testimony, Mr. Roe stated, My understanding is that a sealing order is not an injunction, and he cited in his testimony a case called Roman Catholic Diocese, a Kentucky case, the Supreme Court. And Judge Glasser stated, Your understanding is correct.

JUDGE CABRANES: When Roe obtained these documents, were any of them marked in any way that suggested that they were under seal?

MR. LERNER: Not the criminal information, not the complaint, not the cooperation agreement. There were markings on the PSR. I don't recall the exact language of the PSR, but it is not a 65(d) injunction, which must be directed to specific individuals. It must state the basis for the injunction. It is not a court order directed to Mr. Oberland -- Mr. Roe.

JUDGE CABRANES: You can refer to him by name here.

It's all right. We are all under seal here. But, of course,
you may not believe in sealing orders. But you can feel free
to refer to anyone here by the correct name or the code name,
as you wish.

1	MR. LERNER: Well, the PSR doesn't have injunctive
2	language in accordance with Rule 65(d). Therefore, it is not
3	subject to it is not an injunction. It could not bar the
4	dissemination by Mr. Roe.
5	JUDGE CABRANES: Take 60 seconds and wrap up your
6	argument.
7	MR. LERNER: Your Honors, we are here before the Court
8	on a motion to seal the docket. There has been no record
9	finding in support of the sealing of the docket. There's no
10	evidence that has been submitted, there's argument, but no
11	evidence to support the sealing of the docket. And in order to
. 12	seal a docket, there must be on-the-record findings
13	demonstrating its propriety. I would also like to state
14	JUDGE POOLER: Don't we have an admission from Mr. Roe
15	that he has these documents? Isn't that per se evidence?
16	Isn't that enough?
17	MR. LERNER: To seal the appellate docket?
18	JUDGE POOLER: Yes. He has records that the judges
19	thought were under seal already. He has them and admitted he
20	has them.
21	MR. LERNER: Yes, he has them.
22	JUDGE POOLER: Why isn't that enough evidence to seal
23	the record until further order of this court?
24	MR. LERNER: Because in <u>Hartford Courant</u> this court
25	said it is inappropriate to seal an entire court docket.
Į	

JUDGE POOLER: But that is also a newspaper case. 1 MR. LERNER: I would submit, your Honors, that under 2 <u>Citizens United</u> all individuals have the same First Amendment 3 The Supreme Court stated it expressly. We no longer rights. 4 distinguish between newspapers and individuals. 5 JUDGE POOLER: But newspapers have a special charge in 6 7 publishing information for citizens. Mr. Roe doesn't have any charge in making this information available to citizens. 8 MR. LERNER: Mr. Roe has the charge to represent his 9 10 clients, who have the charge to represent, as they are acting 11 in a fiduciary role, they represent they are acting derivatively and representing many investors. So he has a 12 First Amendment right to use and publish these documents as he 13 will. 14 Now I will state very directly, your Honor, the fact 15 16 that this is not out in the public proves Mr. Roe's good faith. He has never circulated this publicly. He asserts his absolute 17 right to do so, but he has not done so. 18 We ask that the Court abide by U.S. Supreme Court 19 20 precedent, and if it is to hold that this proceeding is to be 21 closed, that the docket is to be closed, that record findings be made on evidence, and there is no evidence here to support 22 the burden of proof that is on the government. 23 JUDGE CABRANES: Let me ask you directly, you have 24 filed a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court? 25

1	MR. LERNER: We have filed a petition to stay this
2	proceeding. Every name that could give anyone notice as to
3	what is going on here was redacted. I provided that to this
4	Court in advance before filing it. I provided it to counsel in
5	advance before filing it.
6	JUDGE POOLER: Did you file it at noon as you said you
7	were going to do?
8	MR. LERNER: It was filed precisely at noon.
- 9	JUDGE CABRANES: Today?
10	MR. LERNER: No, it was filed at noon on Friday.
11	JUDGE CABRANES: Noon on Friday.
12	MR. LERNER: It was denied.
13	JUDGE CABRANES: It was denied already?
14	MR. LERNER: Yes.
15	JUDGE CABRANES: So there's nothing pending before the
16	Supreme Court at this point?
17	MR. LERNER: That is correct.
18	JUDGE CABRANES: Lest there be any confusion, we think
19	that you should make whatever arrangements are appropriate with
20	the Clerk of the Supreme Court to make sure that this
21	now-defunct proceeding remains under seal for the time being.
22	That is for you to apply, and you can indicate to them on
23	notice to the government that you are doing so at the request
24	of the Court.
i	1

In any event, any further appeals to the Supreme Court

1	should be, unless you hear otherwise from this Court, properly
2	denominated as under seal. Is that understood?
3	MR. LERNER: Yes, absolutely, your Honor.
4	JUDGE CABRANES: It is so ordered.
5	JUDGE CHIN: Is it understood that it applies not just
6	to Court personnel but to anyone with notice of it, including
7	your client, without prejudice to your position, but otherwise
8	we are going to be right back to square one.
9	MR. LERNER: I think we will understand it to mean
10	that any petition will not be widely disseminated. It will go
11	from my hands
12	JUDGE CABRANES: Will not be disseminated, period.
13	MR. LERNER: Will not be disseminated, period. It
14	will be in my hands, Mr. Roe's hands, counsel's hands.
15	JUDGE CABRANES: We will recess, and we may have
16	something for you. We would like you to stand by, and we are
17	going to consult with the Clerk of Court and others and we hope
18	to have something for you promptly.
19	Thank you.
20	(Recess)
21	JUDGE CABRANES: It is 2:53 p.m. I have asked the
22	clerk to enter an order that was entered formally at 2:45 p.m.,
23	copies of which are being delivered at this very moment to
24	those counsel who are present.

We will take a moment or two to review the order.

Page 2 of course is a description of past proceedings.

Page 3 deals with the petition information, the writ of mandamus, which you will note has been denied, and the docket in that proceeding and all documents referenced therein shall remain sealed until further order of the Court.

On page 4 we turn to the request by the government for injunctive relief. There will be a remand to the district court for the limited purpose of enforcing this Court's orders and the related district court orders while the appeal goes forward on the merits. And the appeal will be expedited.

There is a briefing schedule on page 5. This is a remand under <u>U.S. v. Jacobson</u>. This panel shall retain jurisdiction over the pending appeal both for the disposition of the appeal on the merits as well as with respect to any further motions practice.

Any other appeals from the district court's order granting the permanent and temporary injunctions at issue and any appeals arising from any further proceedings in the district court, including any further petitions for extraordinary writs, including the writ of mandamus. It is so ordered.

Is there anything else anyone wishes to.

Why don't you come to the microphone so we can have the benefit of your comments?

MR. LERNER: The matter in the Southern District is

presently stayed with an order to Mr. Roe to file a 1 supplemental complaint upon the completion of the proceedings 2 before Judge Glasser. 3 We understand that he's been enjoined from making any 4 further applications. However, he would like to submit 5 application to Judge Buchwald to request further --6 JUDGE CABRANES: He has not been enjoined from making 7 8 any further applications. You have misread this order. He has 9 been enjoined from making any dissemination of any of these documents. 10 You can appear before Judge Buchwald at any time you 11 think appropriate, and the only condition that I would place on 12 13 that would be that you should, in making any presentation to 14 Judge Buchwald, attach to any filing a copy of this order. MR. LERNER: Thank you, your Honor. 15 JUDGE CABRANES: It is so ordered. 16 Yes? Any further applications or comments? 17 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, my name is Kelly Moore. 18 I'm 19 with the form of Morgan Lewis & Bockius. We have been representing Mr. Doe for sometime now. Unfortunately our legal 20 fees have gone through the roof on this matter, and a couple of 21 months ago he retained a former colleague of mine, Mr. Beys, to 22 represent him in connection with the Southern District. 23 JUDGE CABRANES: That's fine. 24

Let me just say I handled your application as a

X12endoen

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SEALED one-judge application, but frankly, not knowing what was going on at the time that your application arrived, I denied it without prejudice. I gather that you are now renewing your application to withdraw and to be substituted? MS. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE CABRANES: The application is granted. MS. MOORE: Thank you. MR. BEYS: Thank you. JUDGE CABRANES: Anything else? Does the government need any comment or application? MR. KAMINSKY: Very briefly, your Honor.

The government during the brief recess had an opportunity to first look at opposition's letter in terms of which further counsel they've spoken to and submitted the filed documents. The government is very concerned generally, but particularly concerned about one specific attorney who represents a large amount of individuals accused of being part of organized crime families.

JUDGE CABRANES: I don't mean to minimize the importance of what you are saying, but I think my colleagues will agree that your concerns should now be addressed to the district court. I think you will wish to contact Chief Judge Dearie to determine who exactly is going to handle the implementation of the court's mandate. And that judge can hear any concern or application by you with respect to that.

On the other hand, you may wish to complete the record 1 before our Court and state whatever you think appropriate. You 2 3 may wish to include some of that in the briefing on the merits, but I think if you're asking for relief or you want to apply 4 for relief in that regard, you should take it up in the Eastern 5 District of New York. 6 7 Is that agreeable? MR. KAMINSKY: Absolutely, your Honor. There was just 8 more of a technical question of whether today's sealed 9 proceeding would bar the government from speaking with one of 1.0 those attorneys and asking for the documents back. 11 JUDGE CABRANES: No. 12 13 MR. KAMINSKY: Thank you. JUDGE POOLER: Counsel, before you sit down, this 14 matter before us was triggered by your motion for a temporary 15 stay of the unsealing. 16 17 MR. KAMINSKY: Yes. Do you have reason to believe that the 18 JUDGE POOLER: documents were about to be unsealed? 19 MR. KAMINSKY: Yes. 20 JUDGE POOLER: What is the basis for that? 21 MR. KAMINSKY: We spoke to the Clerk of the Court here 22 23 and we were informed that, unless someone makes a motion, it's going to be unsealed. It was sealed as a matter of course when 24 the appeal was filed. 25

JUDGE POOLER: That is, the appeal in this Court? MR. KAMINSKY: Yes. Correct. That was sealed pro forma, and when we called to inquire about it they said not for long, so we made this motion. JUDGE POOLER: Thank you. Thank you for clearing that up. JUDGE CABRANES: Thanks very much. We are in recess. (Adjourned)